assessment, because they didn't have the tools 1 2 to do that. Dennis Faulk came to me from EPA and 3 said, how about if we do the B.C. reactor area 4 and do a comprehensive assessment, look at all 5 of the waste sites, look at all of the 6 critters, look at all of the groundwater 7 issues, and try to do a risk assessment for 8 9 that. They made a commitment, Department 10 of Energy came back and made a commitment to 11 the public, made a commitment to the Tribes, 12 that the B.C. risk assessment, comprehensive 13 risk assessment, pilot project, would be the 14 15 starting point for public involvement. And 16 that they would do this and use that as a 17 template to then move forward to do other risk 18 assessments. They moved forward this year to do 19 20 an N-Area risk assessment, and we have not been 21 involved. Now we hear that they want to do a 22 23 whole comprehensive risk assessment, when they've never created the baseline to do the 24 B.C. reactor area. 25 117

(541) 276-9491

BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES

(800) 358-2345

I requested a response from each	
agency. Not the Tri-Parties. I got a call	
from the Department of Energy that refused to	
answer the letter. And said we're going to	
delay our response required by two weeks. They	
delayed it, never responded.	
I did get a response from U.S. Fish	
and Wildlife, and they concurred with exactly	
my assessment. They came back and said they	
agree and they would like the B.C. reactor	
pilot project for everything.	
Now I get a letter from the	
Tri-Parties, coming together, that then molds	
all their issues together, instead of getting	
an individual response from EPA, an individual	
response from the State Department of Ecology	
and DOE.	
So, what Nick says, he's been here	
for seven months, and no punn intended, we have	
a lot of history, and we have a lot of	
commitments that the Department of Energy was	
going to do this. They haven't stuck with	
their commitment.	
MR. DEE WILLIS: Let's move	
on. Next question. This gentlemen over here,	
	119
	agency. Not the Tri-Parties. I got a call from the Department of Energy that refused to answer the letter. And said we're going to delay our response required by two weeks. They delayed it, never responded. I did get a response from U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and they concurred with exactly my assessment. They came back and said they agree and they would like the B.C. reactor pilot project for everything. Now I get a letter from the Tri-Parties, coming together, that then molds all their issues together, instead of getting an individual response from EPA, an individual response from the State Department of Ecology and DOE. So, what Nick says, he's been here for seven months, and no punn intended, we have a lot of history, and we have a lot of commitments that the Department of Energy was going to do this. They haven't stuck with their commitment. MR. DEE WILLIS: Let's move

110

speak into the mike they I am bringing to you. 1 MR. MIKE ROCKWELL: Thank you. 2 This one is for the officials up there. Mike 3 Rockwell is my name. 4 How much volume of cleanup -- Well, 5 let me rephrase that. Is the volume of cleanup 6 that is planned over the next, let's just say 7 two years, going to equal the volume of waste 8 9 that will be delivered to Hanford over the next two years? The 70,000 truck loads that are 10 coming to Hanford in whatever time frame that 11 is, is there going to be 70,000 truck loads of 12 cleanup, is there going to be a balanced out 13 thing. 14 15 MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Nick can help we me with this. Volume up, there will be 16 a lot more cleaned up than we will ever get. 17 What the factor is, I don't know. But it's a 18 lot more. 19 MR. NICHOLAS CETO: There is a 20 chart. I don't have the document. But there 21 is a chart in the document, I don't have it in 22 front of me but we could probably find it 23 pretty quickly, that gives the volume of the 24 different waste streams, what's been disposed 25 119 (541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
ų.	
1	of at Hanford far and what's going to be
2	managed in the cleanup in the remaining years.
3	And you can look at those bar graphs
4	and get a feel.
5	Part of the answer, part of the
6	answer depends on how much comes in from
7	off-site. Because the range of material coming
8	in from off-site is very large in that
9	document.
10	MR. DEE WILLIS: Panel?
11	MR. GREG deBRULER: One other
12	comment which we didn't really touch on
13	tonight.
14	When the first draft came out, Mike,
15	I had the understanding, and actually commented
16	in Portland and asked you the question, the
17	initial salvo, we will call it, is 70,000 truck
18	loads, but in reality it could go much higher
19	than that in the future with an amendment, and
20	I asked that question, and you said yes, it
21	could, it could go higher than 70,000.
22	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: No, not
23	with an amendment. With a new EIS.
24	MR. GREG deBRULER: Or a
25	supplement.
	120
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: No. You
2	would have to have a new Waste Management PEIS
3	supplement.
4	MR. GREG deBRULER: Because
5 .	the concern I have is the 70,000 is what they
6	have scoped right now. Of course you have got
7	104 sites. How accurate are they? We did
8	learn, however, in these transuranic waste
9	shipments that there was actually 9 percent, of
10	these 160 barrels that they were shipping, they
11	actually were off by 9 percent. There was 9
12	percent more volume coming in.
13	So, I am sitting here in 2003
14	thinking you have got 70,000 truck loads.
15	Well, is it 80,000? I don't know. I mean,
16	these are rough numbers. And I don't really
17	know. So I will just leave it there.
18	MR. DEE WILLIS: Do we have a
19	follow-up question here?
20	Go ahead, George.
21	MR. GEORGE SANDERS: I was
22	just going to take another slice at what you
23	were heading toward with respect to what's
24	leaving and what's staying and coming.
25	I use a rule of thumb of, and this
	121
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

9		
1	is planned, I won't tell you that this is going	
2	to happen in the next year or two, but it's	
3	what's supposed to happen in our baseline,	
4	we've got about 400 million curies of material	
5	on-site right now. If you take the tanks, the	
6	spent fuel, everything else.	
7	MR. DEE WILLIS: Curie? What's	
8	a curie?	
	50 (50000000000000000000000000000000000	
9	MR. GEORGE SANDERS: Curies.	
10	That's a measure of radioactivity. It has to	
11	do with how many disintegrations you get any	
12	period of time from a nucleus of an atom. It's	
13	a measure. And we use curies as one of those	
14	measurements.	
15	There is 400 million curies that are	
16	on-site. I think we are planning on about 35	
17	million curies of that staying. I think out of	
18	that bunch. I think it's about 35. So, 365	
19	million, give or take a few, are supposed to	
20	leave. And so that's the balance of things.	
21	Now, when you break that up in	
22	shipments, right now if you, that 70,000 may be	
23	trucks. I think by the time we are through	
24	with this we will be trying to do some rail	
25	shipments, we will be trying to send things out	
		122

122

			_
1		in boxes instead of using trucks. So that's	
2		going to cut the shipments down. That's not	
3		interstate highways. That's rail. That has	
4	8	its own interesting pluses and minuses. But it	
5		will probably be different types of	
6		transportation there.	
7		So, you know, that shipment number	
8		can vary. But there's a lot of shipments that	
9		are going to be on the road outbound as well as	
10	til.	some coming in.	
11		MR. DEE WILLIS: Follow-up.	
12		MR. MIKE ROCKWELL: Again for	}
13		the officials here, I would like to introduce	
14		you to my five year old daughter here, Miah.	
15		MR. GEORGE SANDERS: Hey, by	
16		the way, she came over to see me a while ago.	
17		She had some stickers. And she gave me one. I	
18		am going to carry it home on my watch. I	
19		really appreciate it. Thank you.	
20		MR. MIKE ROCKWELL: All right.	
21		Well, earlier, about an hour ago, we were	3.
22		discussing the fact that we're not really aware	
23		of how fast the river will be contaminated, and	0.
24		we had that ongoing discussion a little bit	
25		here, and I asked this question at the last	
		12	3
		(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345	

1	meeting and it wasn't answered, and it was	
2	again asked here, and it seems to be a question	
3	maybe that's unanswerable.	
4	But my daughter is going to be	
5	living along the Columbia River for, she is	
6	going to be growing up here, she is going to be	
7,	playing in the Columbia River, so it is a real	
8	concern to me.	
9	And since this meeting is about	
10	bringing more waste to Hanford, and yet over	
11	the last 15 years of studying this plume that's	
12	going towards the Columbia River, we haven't	
13	figured out when the river is going to be	
14	contaminated so much that she can't safely play	
15	in it. And yet you are bringing more stuff to	
16	Hanford.	
17	I mean, if she were your daughter,	
18	wouldn't you be extremely concerned about	
19	bringing more waste to Hanford?	
20	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: At the	
21	risk of some one upmanship, I have four	
22	children, including a five-year old daughter,	
23	and I am extremely concerned, because our water	
24	comes six miles downstream from Hanford, in the	
25	Columbia River. We go swimming in it almost	
		10

124

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1	every day in the summer. So, yes, I am very
2	concerned about it.
3	MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay. This
4	lady, the nurse, I have forgotten your name.
5	MS. JUDY MERRILL: Judy
6	Merrill. You remember I'm a nurse. Judy
7	Merrill from The Dalles.
8	I'd like to ask one of the officials
9	of DOE or EPA, what specifically do you need
10	from the public, we the citizens, to change
11	your date of 45 days of the analysis to be
12	studied? What specifically do you need from
13	us? Or is it not up for grabs?
14	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: I would
15	like to leave this one for Greg.
16	MR. GREG deBRULER: Let's let
17	the EPA do it first and I will give him my
18	interpretation.
19	MR. NICHOLAS CETO: There is
20	only one agency that can change that. It's not
21	us. It's DOE.
22	Ms. JUDY MERRILL: Oh. DOE?
23	MR. NICHOLAS CETO: They are
24	the ones who are going to have to answer this
25	question.
	125
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: The	
2	decision is ours, but that's not The	
3	decision is ours, but I guess, in my position,	
4	I'm not at liberty to say what kind of	
5	pressures could be put on DOE to change their	
6	mind.	
7	MR. GEORGE SANDERS: I'm not	
8	going to let Mike take the hit on that one. We	
9	will just talk about that.	
10	The decision makers, and that's a	
11	whole series of senior folks, because you	
12	understand there's a lot of sensitivity here.	
13	I'm just going to be straight up.	
14	MS. JUDY MERRILL: I'd like	
15	some specific information. I am a citizen, I	
16	have taken time off from work to be here.	
17	MR. GEORGE SANDERS: All	
18	right. I will tell you, here is the best way	
19	we can do it.	
20	You are in the middle of a public	
21	process. This is a public meeting. I mean, we	
22	have got a court reporter here, this is going	
23	to be documented.	
24	I think what you're doing is the	
25	best thing I can recommend to you. If you feel	
		126
	(E41) 276-0401 PRIDGES (ACCOCTATES (900) 359-2345	

1	strongly, and I get the sense that there is a
2	lot of people that feel strongly about this 45
3	days.
4	Speak your piece. And believe you
5	me, we are going to listen to it. We will have
6	to take your comments, we are going to have to
7	put a report together. We are going to have to
8	talk to our senior management. And we will
9	make it very well known what the comment
10	packages were.
11	MS. JUDY MERRILL: We only have
12	45 days.
13	MR. GEORGE SANDERS: I
14	understand that. And I understand your angst
15	about that.
16	So my recommendation to you is be
17	very specific in your comments so that we can
18	record them, it will get laid out in front of
19	senior people who will make those decisions,
20	and we will just go from there. That's all I
21	can tell you.
22	MR. GREG deBRULER: Two things.
23	Do you want to go first?
24	MS. AMBER WALDREF: You will
25	probably say the same thing.
	127

1	MR. GREG deBRULER: No.	
2	MS. AMBER WALDREF: Well, i	
3	also want to ask the Department of Energy, you	
4	know, is this a site, an EIS that's based at	
5	the site and that managers at the site can make	
6	this type of decision? Because that's one of	
7	the questions at hand, I think.	
8	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: The	
9	approval authority for the Environment Impact	
10	Statement and the decision, the final decision	
11	to extend the comment period would rest with	
12	the manager of Hanford who would be Keith	
13	Klein.	
14	MR. GEORGE SANDERS: And I	
15	will tell you this, this is a big deal, an EIS,	
16	it is far reaching, and I don't think it is a	
17	mystery to you that Keith is consulting with	
18	the senior management in DOE on this.	
19	So, there is a lot of	
20	collaborations, a lot of discussions about	
21	this. This is a very highly visible activity	
22	back in Washington. So there will be a lot of	
23	consultation. But Mike is right about who has	
2 4	the authority.	
25	MR. DEE WILLIS: Greg.	
		128
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345	

1	MR. GREG deBRULER: So, names.
2	Keith Klein is the manager. You could write
3	him a nice letter. Tell him that he's
4	violating NEPA and you will probably be seeing
5	him in court. That might wake him up.
6	The other thing you could do is
7	write a letter to the Under Secretary of
8	Energy, Jessie Roberson, R-o-b-e-r-s-o-n.
9	Secretary of Energy Abraham, tell
10	him that you are outraged that the public
11	outreach process is being violated, that NEPA
12	is being violated. That that there is not
13	adequate time.
14	And the other guy is Bob Card, is
15	that his first name, Bob? Mr. Card, Bob Card.
16	Bob Card is one of the key people that is
17	pushing accelerated cleanup.
18	Now, once you get done writing
19	those, you could also write a letter to the
20	CEQ, Counsel of Environmental Quality, to the
21	Bush Administration, and basically tell them
22	that the Secretary of Energy and the people
23	that work for the Department of Energy are
24	violating NEPA, not giving adequate time for
25	public involvement, and there are statutes that
	100
	129
	i

1	basically tell them what they have to do to	
2	have adequate public involvement.	
3	MR. DEE WILLIS: Greg, would	
4	you repeat those names? I see people writing.	
5	MR. GREG deBRULER: Again, for	
6	the Hanford Site it is Keith Klein, K-l-e-i-n,	3
7	Keith Klein. He is the manager of the Hanford	
8	Site for Richland.	
9	Then the other one is Under	
10	Secretary of Energy Jessie Roberson, and that's	
11	pardon me, Assistant Secretary of Energy,	
12	and that is Jessie Roberson, and that's in	
13	Washington, D.C.	
14	Afterwards I will give you the	
15	addresses. I actually have them in my brain.	
16	Secretary of Energy Abraham.	
17	MR. DEE WILLIS: Spencer.	
18	MR. GREG deBRULER: Spencer	
19	Abraham. There we go. And the other one is	
20	Bob Card. And what is his title?	
21	MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: I have	
22	no idea.	
23	MS. AMBER WALDREF: He is	
24	Under Secretary.	
25	MR. GREG deBRULER: Is he	
	1:	30
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345	

1	Under Secretary?
2	MR. GEORGE SANDERS: I think
3	so.
4	MR. GREG deBRULER: He thinks
5	so. I think he knows, but he doesn't want to
6	mention names, because he is on the record.
7	Some DOE official said he thinks so. I'm
8	having fun, Mr. X.
9	MR. DEE WILLIS: Go back to
10	the addresses.
11	MR. GREG deBRULER: Oh. The
12	address for Hanford is P.O. Box 550, Richland,
13	Washington, 99352.
14	MS. JUDY MERRILL: It's on
15	the fact sheets.
16	MR. GREG deBRULER: And for
17	Jessie Roberson, it's 2000 Independence Avenue
18	S.W., Washington, D.C., 20055, Washington,
19	D.C., 20055. That's for the Secretary of
20	Energy Spencer Abraham, or the Assistant
21	Secretary Jessie Roberson. And for Mr. Bob
22	Card, who is Mr. X.
23	MS. JUDY MERRILL: And their
24	address again?
25	MR. GREG deBRULER: 2000
	131
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1	Independence Avenue S. W., Washington, D.C.,	
2	20055, I think.	
3	MS. JUDY MERRILL: Greg, what	
4	is Bob's last name?	
5	MR. GREG deBRULER: Card, like	
6	playing cards. This is a big card game, by	
7	the way.	
8	Basically, history, never in the	
9	Tri-Party Agreement have we ever requested,	
10	since 1989, an extension period that was never	
11	granted. It has always been granted.	
12	And the reason why I firmly believe	
13	it is not being granted this time is because	
14	Washington, D.C., Headquarters, is telling them	
15	you shall do this by X date because we need to	
16	get a Record of Decision by X date so we can	
17	ship the product by X date.	
18	They want to close the sites down by	
19	2006, and they have got to start shipping this	
20	stuff.	
21	MS. JUDY MERRILL: My	
22	follow-up. Thank you, Greg, for the specifics.	
23	MR. GREG deBRULER: Welcome.	
24	MS. JUDY MERRILL: What I would	
25	like to see in The Dalles newspaper, White	
		132
	,	
	(541) 276 0401 PRIDCES (ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345	

8	
1	Salmon, Hood River, Goldendale, is that
2	specific information.
3	MR. GREG deBRULER: Okay. I
4	will get it to them tomorrow morning.
5	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where is
6	the local media here tonight?
7	MR. DEE WILLIS: The question
8	is, where is the local media.
9	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could
10	the local media stand up, please?
11	MS. CYNDY deBRULER: You guys
12	need to call them, too.
13	MR. GREG deBRULER: The local
14	media couldn't make it. They also knew, you
15	know, the meeting notices were in the
16	newspapers, right, so they knew the meeting
17	was there, but they couldn't come because they
18	had a bunch of other meetings.
19	So what I did was I took a bunch of
20	pictures today. Now what I have to do is write
21	an article for them to get the information so
22	that they will put an article in the newspaper.
23	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It is
24	not Hood River.
25	MR. GREG deBRULER: No. The
	133
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1	papers all owned by, basically the same, accept	
2	the Goldendale Sentinel. I will be writing an	
3	article, Cyndy and I will put it together, get	
4	the information out and hopefully the press	
5	will put it in the Saturday paper and then The	•
6	Dalles Chronicle and the other papers.	
7	Letters to the editors work, but	
8	I'll tell you what, letters to the editor in	
9	the Tri-Cities would make more sense. Tri-City	
10	Herald in the Tri-Cities, write a letter to the	
11	editor about lack of openness and public stuff.	
12	MR. DEE WILLIS: Panel, next	
13	question. This lady, and then this gentleman.	
14	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nick,	
15	you said EPA fined DOE 76,000. Aren't those	
16	both federal agencies. And if you fine	
17	somebody, who gets the money?	
18	MR. NICHOLAS CETO: Yes. We	
19	are both federal agencies. And it goes back to	
20	the treasury. Sometimes I think, and someone	
21	from DOE can verify this, that sometimes the	
22	contractor that misses the work they are	
23	supposed to do ends up paying part of that back	
24	to the government, or not getting a fee or	
25	something.	
		134
	·	

1	So they could probably answer that
2	question.
3	But it is a difficult thing when one
4	agency fines another. But there is the P.R.
5	value. You know, when a federal agency gets
6	fined by another one, they don't like the press
7	they get, and that's as valuable as the money.
8	MR. GREG deBRULER: And they
9	don't like explaining it to Congress why they
10	got that either.
11	MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay.
12	Name.
13	MR. CLAY SMITH: Clay Smith.
14	I've got a couple of questions.
15	First of all, Greg, you had some,
16	they are not really slides, but some film you
17	showed earlier. I would kind of like to know
18	where those came from. I mean,
19	MR. GREG deBRULER: They came
20	courtesy of the Department of Energy.
21	MR. CLAY SMITH: So the
22	Department of Energy actually did that
23	evaluation and that was part of their
24	information?
25	MR. GREG deBRULER: If you're
	135
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

1	talking about the risk map for the groundwater?	
2	MR. CLAY SMITH: Yeah.	
3	MR. GREG deBRULER: That was	
4	actually done by, it was Pacific Northwest	
5	National Labs under contract to the Department	
6	of Energy, actually ran the model that did that	
7	calculation.	
8	MR. CLAY SMITH: Okay. So	
9	they are just putting information that they	
10	suppose in a computer and supposedly come out	
11	with a supposed map?	
12	MR. GREG deBRULER: They have	
13	seven models that they are using, and to do	
14	that calculation, I think Tom Stoops could	
15	really tell you how they got to these numbers,	
16	because this is Tom Stoops, he's a hydrologist,	
17	he does this kind of stuff, so maybe he wants	
18	to say something.	
19	MR. CLAY SMITH: I have a	
20	question about that for Tom also.	
21	How big is the aquifer underneath	
22	that area, or is there one? Water travels, you	
23	know, underneath the earth at various levels	
24	and you have aquifers, and then you don't have	
25	any, and some of the earth is porous. So it	
		136
	(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345	